



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,076	10/12/2005	Naomi Yonemura	278097US2PCT	2726
22850	7590	06/06/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			LI, MEIYA	
1940 DUKE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			2811	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/06/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/553,076	Applicant(s) YONEMURA ET AL.
	Examiner MEIYALI	Art Unit 2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10/12/05 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0254/05)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/12/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I, claims 1-4, in the reply filed on April 16, 2008 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 5-18 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected groups, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on April 16, 2008.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on October 12, 2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

5. Figures 1-1 and 1-2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct

any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. The claimed limitation of "the circuit", as recited in claim 1, is unclear as to which circuit applicant refers.

9. The claimed limitation of "a low capacitance portion ... a circuit portion on which the control semiconductor is mounted", as recited in claim 1, is unclear as to which elements, the low capacitance portion or the circuit portion, on which the control semiconductor is mounted.

10. The claimed limitation of "the circuit portion on which the control semiconductor is mounted is provided on the low capacitance portion embedded in the metal plate via the insulating layer", as recited in claim 4, is unclear as to which elements, circuit portion or low capacitance portion, in between the metal plate and the insulating layer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claim 1, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (5,661,343).

Takahashi et al. show in Fig. 10 and related texts (see, i.e. Cols. 5 and 7) a metal based circuit board 1 to be used for a hybrid integrated circuit, comprising circuits 31/10 provided on a metal plate 1 via an insulating layer 11, a power semiconductor 6 (Col. 4, lines 48-49) mounted on the circuit 10 (Col. 7, line 11) and a control semiconductor 9 (Col. 5, line 1) to control the power semiconductor 6, provided on the circuit 31 (Col. 5, line 9), wherein a low capacitance portion 22 is embedded under a circuit portion on which the control semiconductor 9 is mounted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

15. Claim 2, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. (5,661,343) in view of Isshiki et al. (6,235,862).

Takahashi et al. disclosed substantially the entire claimed invention, as applied to claim 1 above, except the low capacitance portion is made of a resin containing an inorganic filler and has a dielectric constant of from 2 to 9.

Isshiki et al. teaches the low capacitance portion 9 is made of a resin containing an inorganic filler and has a dielectric constant of from 2 to 9 (Fig. 2, Col. 8, lines 53-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use lower dielectric constant material, as taught by Isshiki et al., in Takahashi et al.'s device, in order to reduce the capacitance of the structure and increase the device speed.

16. Claims 3 and 4, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. (5,661,343).

As for claim 3, Takahashi et al. disclosed substantially the entire claimed invention, as applied to claim 1 above, except the thickness of the low capacitance portion is from 100 to 1,000 μm .

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include low capacitance portion is from 100 to 1,000 μm thick, in order to optimize the performance of the device. Furthermore, it has been held that where then general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

It has been held in that the applicant must show that a particular range is critical, generally by showing that the claimed range achieves unexpected results relative to the prior art range. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Note that the law is replete with cases in which when the mere difference between the claimed invention and the prior art is some dimensional limitation or other variable within the claims, patentability cannot be found. The instant disclosure does not set forth evidence ascribing unexpected results due to the claimed dimensions. See *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 1984), which held that the dimensional limitations failed to point out a feature which performed and operated any differently from the prior art.

As for claim 4, Takahashi et al. show the circuit portion on which the control semiconductor 9 is mounted is provided on the low capacitance portion 22 embedded in the metal plate 1 via the insulating layer 11 (Fig. 10).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MEIYA LI whose telephone number is (571)270-1572. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM Eastern Standard Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Gurley can be reached on (571) 272-1670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 2811
6/3/2008

/Ori Nadav/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2811